

REA Workshop Report

Antigua, Guatemala workshop

23-25 April 2003

Report prepared May 1, 2003

Charles Dufresne – InterWorks, LLC

Table of Contents

I.	Background	2
II.	Participant Evaluations	2
I.	Participants.....	3
II.	Timing and Workshop Schedule.....	3
III.	Training team	3
V.	Recommendations for improving the workshop and trainer’s guide.....	4
VI.	Pre-workshop administration, coordination and logistics.....	4
Annex 1	Kelly’s review of the workshop.....	6
Annex 2	Consolidation and Analysis Exercise.....	12
Annex 3	Evaluation	13
Annex 4	Participant List.....	15
Annex 5	Workshop Agenda	16
Annex 5	Workshop Agenda	17
Annex 6	Pre-workshop planning coordination matrix	19

I. Background

The REA Guidelines

CARE International and the Benfield Hazard Research Centre, University College London, have prepared a methodology to assess the impact on the environment, first of disasters and then of the disaster survivors. The purpose of this exercise has been to develop a method or an approach for NGOs and donors to develop disaster response programs that take into account the environment, thereby lessening negative impacts. This methodology has now been articulated within a draft *Guidelines for Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment in Disasters*. These guidelines have been field tested in Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Indonesia. The lessons learned from the field study have been fed back into revisions of the *Guidelines* as well as into the design of a training program to bring the concepts, principles and practices of this topic to field practitioners.

Guatemala Workshop: 2nd pilot test

The second REA pilot workshop was held for CARE Central America and their partners in Antigua, Guatemala from April 23-25, 2003, at the Hotel Casa Sto. Domingo. (The first was held in Norway, sponsored by CARE Norway, from 8 – 10 April, 2003, in Oslo.)

The training team consisted of lead trainer Charles Dufresne, InterWorks; co-trainers Mario Pareja, Independent Consultant and REA Guidelines co-author, and Becky Myton, CARE Honduras; and advisor/observer Charles Kelly, Independent Consultant/Benfield Hazard Research Center and REA Guidelines co-author. The workshop was conducted in Spanish.

Workshop objectives

The objectives for the workshop participants were as follows:

- Describe the purpose and rationale of the REA
- Describe how disasters and the environment are interconnected
- Be able to implement all four modules of an REA in an emergency situation
- Be able to make recommendations on disaster response programming that take into consideration REA results

II. Participant Evaluations

Judging from the participant evaluations, the workshop was well received and the large majority of participants responded that REA was relevant to their work and that the workshop sufficiently prepared them to conduct an REA on their own. Several mentioned that the REA methodology dovetails well with the Disaster Needs and Damage Assessment methodology that they are using (presumably based on the OFDA/LAC DANA training offered for years in Central and Latin America).

During the workshop, the CARE CAMI team was very helpful and responsive. Also, Mario Pareja deserves special recognition for doing much more than was expected of him. Throughout the workshop he translated and/or corrected translated documents and facilitated sessions as needed (since the original co-trainer was delayed for two days).

I. Participants

The number of participants varied between 15 and 21, depending on the day and the session. Three participants showed up on the second day due to travel difficulties. Many of them were operational field workers who have experienced disasters, including earthquakes in El Salvador, and Hurricane Mitch in Central America. This practical field orientation seemed to contribute to their interest in the REA theme and their ability to quickly understand and absorb the concepts and tools.

II. Timing and Workshop Schedule

When planning the workshop agenda, the training team needs to consider the number of participants, their field experience, their culture, and meal arrangements when estimating how much time will be required for each session and breaks. The greater the number of participants, the more time required to conduct each session, and therefore the entire workshop. The more field experience participants bring to the workshop, the more they will want to share and discuss practical experience—all of which requires more time. The more blasé their attitude towards “starting times”, and “coffee breaks”, the longer each day will need to run. Finally, if participants are lunching outside of the workshop venue, an extra half-hour will need to be allocated for this activity. In Norway, the trainers were generally able to respect the agenda schedule as designed. There, they had 10 participants and few with operational field experience. They were disciplined about the proposed schedule, and ate their lunch on site. In contrast, in Guatemala, all sessions on the first two days started late and ran over in time. By the end of the second day, we were two entire sessions behind. This required us to significantly shorten several of Friday’s sessions and activities. In Guatemala, there were 15-18 participants, most with operational field experience. As a group they had difficulty keeping to the workshop time schedule and also were lunching outside of the workshop venue.

III. Training team

Most of the training was facilitated by Mario Pareja (Independent Consultant, REA Guidelines co-author) and Charles Dufresne (InterWorks). Due to travel delays, Becky Myton (CARE-Honduras) arrived late on the second day, and helped facilitate on the third day. Charles Kelly (REA Guidelines Co-Author, Independent Consultant Benfield Hazard Research Center) provided administrative and technical support throughout the workshop, and on occasion provided advice to the trainers when they were unfamiliar with a concept in the guidelines, or with the conduct of a training session, since he had attended the first pilot training in Norway.

While experienced disaster management trainers can lead REA workshops using the guidelines and training material that was developed, it is very useful to have on the training team at least one resource person/trainer, who has first hand experience and knowledge of the environmental-disaster links, and who has actually implemented and tested the REA. The REA method is not theory, but practice, and thus it is useful to have someone who can present their lessons learned and respond precisely to the operational and practical questions raised by participants.

The sessions lead by each trainer is noted in the attached agenda.

V. Recommendations for improving the workshop and trainer's guide

1. Include a running case study that is used for each session and in completion of forms. This can then be used for the completion of the Consolidation and Analysis Exercise, per revised instructions—see annex 2.
2. Revise the Basic Needs Presentation. Eliminate slides differentiating between Standards and Indicators, and just include three or four slides with examples of indicators for the different sectors. Also, include in the case study more “indicator hints” that correlate with the most well known sectorial indicators. For example, if it is known that approximately xx kg/person day of food is required, then one can calculate the types of trucks and frequency of transportation of food items. However, the participant's case didn't include this information, nor was the indicator noted in their Basic Needs Form.
3. Simplify the Basic Needs Form, and include the most common and important Sphere indicators on a separate sheet for easy reference. More hints about indicators need to be included in the case study.
4. If presenting this workshop to field people familiar with disasters and disaster response, it might be possible to cut down the first day presentations. For example, one could merge the sessions “Link between disasters and the Environment” and “Disaster Management”, and/or reduce the session “Introduction to Disasters Management”.
5. Need better examples of “Green Procurement.”
6. Change the Consolidation Exercise per attached annex 2.
7. Shorten titles of the REA forms and of the Workshop sessions.

VI. Pre-workshop administration, coordination and logistics

The responsibilities for the pre-workshop administration, management and logistics were decentralized among seven staff from the collaborating organizations: CARE USA in Atlanta, Georgia (1 person), CARE Central America “CARE CAMI” (3 people: 2 in Honduras, 1 in Guatemala), InterWorks in Madison, Wisconsin (2 people) and Benfield Hazard Research Center UK (1 person, represented by Charles Kelly). Each fulfilled their individual responsibilities to the best of their ability, but decisions taken by one collaborator often created new tasks and responsibilities for the other collaborators, which were not coordinated, nor discussed nor delegated in a timely manner.

The lack of timely coordination and communication led to confusion especially regarding the participants and their language proficiencies, and to misunderstanding, delay and duplication of efforts regarding the translations. For example, while the original plan was to conduct a pilot test of the REA in English, just one month before the workshop dates, it became clear that most of those invited by CARE were national staff from Central American countries, with questionable English language skills, and only a minority of English speakers expected to come from outside the region. On the day before the workshop started, the training team learned that the English speaking participants would not be attending.

While it became obvious that a workshop in Central America for mostly Central American participants would need to be conducted in Spanish, the ramifications of this decision were not discussed nor anticipated by the collaborators until three weeks before the commencement of the

workshop. These ramifications included answers to such questions as: Who was responsible for managing and authorizing the translations? What needed to be translated? Who should do the translations? Who would read the translations to verify their accuracy? Who would pay for the translations and their printing? Could the translations be completed in time?

In the end, because of the confusion, the power point presentations were translated twice. CARE CAMI translated not only the Guidelines and the Workbook, as the training team expected, but also the sixteen power point files, which the training team did not expect. Thus, the training team also either translated or arranged for the translation of these power points. The translated and printed guidelines had to be ditched because the training team determined that many of the translated technical terms and concepts were imprecise, confusing or inaccurate. Due to the timing of the decisions and the late submittal of the translations, there was no time to verify and correct this beforehand.

These pre-workshop administrative and logistical challenges resulted in the training team being continuously distracted by administrative and translation details during the workshop. Rather than focusing on the substance and discussion of the workshops, we were continuously preoccupied with whether or not the translations would be done in time, and then, whether or not they would be printed and copied in time.

Recommendation: Establish and monitor administrative responsibilities, planning and coordination matrix, at least two months prior to the workshop dates. (Annex 4 suggests what such a matrix might contain. Future administrators and trainers should feel free to modify it to meet their needs)

Annex 1 Kelly's review of the workshop

From: C. Kelly, REA Project

Subject: Comments on Antigua Workshop

This memo provides quick comments on the Antigua Workshop, including general comments, the training activities, possible changes to the Guidelines and workshop time line. These comments are, of course, conditioned by my limited knowledge of Spanish.

I. General comments

The idea of presenting a workshop to Spanish speakers based on a document which could not be made available in Spanish verges on the absurd. The apparent success of the workshop in enabling participants to understand and express a confidence in using the REA indicates the superior training and Spanish language capacities of the training team of Charles Dufresne, Mario Pareja and Becky Myton.

The lack of appropriately translated documents was a significant challenge for the workshop. The quick translation of the Guidelines document was inadequate for use in the workshop and there was not sufficient time to revise this document before the end of the workshop. Sections of the translated Participant's Workbook and PowerPoint slides required revisions or new translations. The resulting translation burden fell most specifically on Mario, who also participated significantly as a session presenter.

A direct consequence of translation workload was that a number of sessions had to be developed Aon the fly. Days Two and (particularly) Three of the workshop had a significant ad hoc component. While innovation on the part of the trainers is commendable, the scale of innovation employed does raise a question as to whether the workshop provided a reasonable opportunity to test the specific training materials developed by InterWorks.

A second consequence of the translation burden, an incomplete set of training materials and a need to adjust materials to participant needs, was that sessions in Days One and Two ran over schedule. This problem was exacerbated by a persistent late start of sessions due to tardiness on the part of the participants.

To end the workshop at a reasonable time on Day Three a consensus decision was made to shorten sessions on Day Three. While shortening sessions was necessary to enable the workshop to end on time, the resulting reduction in discussions and exercises could have reduced participant's understanding of various aspects of the REA.

Clearly, a closer monitoring of training schedule is needed in future workshops. Some sort of performance contract with participants may also be useful. At the same time, my view is that the schedule overruns would have been significantly less if the trainers could have devoted more time to training (as opposed to translations and dealing with administrative issues) and the participants had a sufficient set of understandable training materials.

Despite the problems caused by translation needs and scheduling, the workshop does appear to have been successful in training the participants in how to use the REA as a field tool before and in disasters. However, to cement the skill and knowledge gained, it will be necessary to provide participants with correctly translated copies of the Guidelines, Participant's Workbook and PowerPoint slides in Spanish.

While translation was not a task anticipated in this stage of the project, it is now a priority given that we now have people trained to use a Guidelines they may not be able to read.

Finally, the logistical arrangements for the workshop experienced a number of challenges. The workshop hotel was excellent and almost all facilities were more than adequate. Unfortunately, there was confusion as to the per diem, coffee break and meal arrangements on the part of some participants. Although an explanation of these arrangements was provided with the workshop announcement, more needed to be done to ensure all workshop participants understood the arrangements agreed with the hotel and the workshop organizers understood the limitations faced by some participants.

II. Training Activities

1. Training materials and exercises need to be based on local conditions if possible. The training in Antigua used a landslide in western Guatemala which occurred during the workshop as a real situation for use of the REA. This was a good improvisation.
2. Where possible, the training manual should include the use of different exercises and training tools depending on the nature of the group being trained. Or at least the possibility of using different examples and exercises should be noted in the Trainer's manual.
3. There was general agreement among the trainers that the sections for Modules Two (Community Assessment) and Three (Consolidation and Analysis) could be revised to be both easier to present and more appropriate for trainees with field experience. Discussions on this point led to a suggestion that the trainer's materials contain directions on how to adjust each section of the training course for different audiences, with the major division seen between trainees with a practical field background and those with more a theoretical interest in disasters and the environment. This would not mean dumping the existing examples and narrative in these sections, but adding in more field-oriented material.
4. Getting the sessions started on time was a problem and the workshop experienced serious schedule over-run on Days One and Two. Some sort of performance contract may be needed in the future to address this problem, which ultimately affects the presentation of key material on Day Three.
5. The complexity of exercises needs to be reviewed. Some exercises may be too complicated or take too long to present and contribute to the schedule over-run.
6. Training smaller groups (10-12) maybe more effective in terms of up-take, discussions and timing. Although it is hard to compare, it seems that discussions in Oslo took less total time than in Antigua, although both groups were well engaged in the workshop. Fewer participants would allow for more tailored presentations and smaller work groups. This was seen as a advantage in Oslo, while Antigua workgroups didn't seem to have problems with exclusion or non-participation due to their size.
7. A list with common terminology needs to be distributed at the beginning of the workshop.
8. The same disaster scenario needs to be used throughout the training materials.
9. The Community Assessment section needs to be re-thought to make it simpler and easier to present. It seemed that the Antigua participants were much better versed in community assessment than in Oslo. This may be a section which can be expanded or contracted based on participant background and experience.

10. The exercise for the Consolidation and Analysis section may better be focused on a practical application of the consolidation and analysis process (as improvised on Antigua). A practical approach will be particularly important when training field personnel.
11. The use of a disaster game should be considered as part of the Disasters element of the training (a game was improvised in Antigua).
12. The Context Statement presentation needs to be made more lively. One way to do this is to use a current disaster as the base for asking participants to extract the information needed to complete the Context Statement (partially done in Antigua). Alternately, an incomplete Context Statement could be prepared based on a real or fictitious situation and be reviewed and revised by participants.
13. Question 6 of the Context Statement: Note that Canada is one of the few countries which may require an environmental impact assessment for some disaster-related activities. This assessment format can be addressed with the outcomes of a REA exercise.
14. Form 1/Factors: Some of the terms and terminology in this section continue to pose problems. Options to address these problems are to either change how they are presented or eliminate the troublesome sections from the Guidelines.
15. Form 1/Factors: The concept of livelihoods may need to be included in the definition exercise and glossary handout at the beginning of the workshop.
16. Form 3/Unmet needs: The bar chart used in the slides needs to be reviewed. In the unmet needs process, high numbers of good, while the chart may be seen as indicating that high numbers are not good.
17. Form 3/Unmet needs: It remains unclear if all the indicators for each unmet need to be considered in the rating process. Basically, the indicators are provided as indicators and should not be individually rated unless there is (1) sufficient information and (2) the raters are familiar with Sphere. Should this section teach the more complicated (rate all the indicators) or less complicated (only rate broad unmet needs) way of doing Form 3?
18. Form 3/Unmet needs: Teaching methods should emphasize that this form may need to be done in a qualitative manner when data is not available.
19. The presentations by participants were (apparently) well done and well received. Rather than group the presentations at the end of Day Two, it may be better to spread them out as diversions throughout the workshop and use them to draw examples of disaster-environment interactions.
20. The consolidation and analysis process appeared to be relatively easy for the participants. This may be because of their field experience and participants' experience needs to be factored into how this section is presented. For instance, the participants didn't seem to have a problem with reaching agreement on how to consolidate issues or setting priorities, so methods to do these tasks did not need to be emphasized. The opposite was the case in Oslo (and in the field in Indonesia). As a result, methods should be included in the participant's workbook and trainers manual but may not need to be taught in all cases.
21. Discussions about the consolidation and rating process should also focus on (a) what are the implications for the future and (b) what are the direct and indirect environmental implications of issues and proposed actions.

22. A new section on implementation issues was added to the Antigua workshop. This section needs to be formalized into the workshop materials. The points emphasized in the session need to be tailored to the skills and experiences of the participants. Mario can provide his notes and input into this section.

23. A comments and feedback session was also added. The effectiveness of this session needs to be considered in whether it should also become part of the workshop plan.

III. Guidelines Changes

The number of suggestions to the **Guidelines** is limited by my lack of full understanding of all the discussions and questions raised in the workshop. I expect that Mario will be able to suggest additional changes.

1. Repeat Module One Form 4 (on the impact of relief assistance in the environment) as part of the Consolidation and Analysis section to screen for environmental impacts once actions have been identified.

2. Form 1 (Factors) should be further reviewed for clarity.

3. The process for using Form 2 (Hazards) needs to be made evident from reading the headings of each column.

4. We need to seriously consider whether the Sphere-based indicators in the Unmet needs form create more problems than they solve. Going back to two forms, one simple and one with the Sphere standards (the current form) may be optimum.

5. A description of the skill and experience requirements to be an REA Leader could be added as an annex to the Guidelines.

IV. Time line

Note that the schedule of activities was changed from planned as some of the registered participants and one trainer did not arrive as scheduled and there were schedule overruns on Days One and Two. As a result, the following time line provides a real experience indication of the presentation of the REA and in a foreign language.

Topic	Start	Finish	Comments
Day One			
Opening	0910	0919	Introduction by Rigo, also covered some admin matters. (Opening planned for 0830.)
Introduction	0919	0951	
Disaster terminology	0951	1044	Shifted to this position as an introduction to the REA while waiting for late participants.
Coffee	1044	1112	
Workshop Objectives	1112	1150	
Exercise	1150	1217	
Presentation of exercises	1218	1248	
Summary	1248	1255	
Lunch	1255	1435	
AMarco Concept@	1435	1535	Conceptual framework?
Exercise and discussion	1535	1610	
Coffee	1610	1637	
Disasters Overview	1637	1736	Use of game approach good.
Evaluation	1736	1830	Generally positive.
Day Two			
Introduction	0848	0904	Included review of evaluation feedback from previous day.
Disaster Evaluation Process.	0904	0949	Including exercise.
Context Statement	0950	1021	Need to review pictures in PP slides to see if they are easily understood.
Exercise	1021	1110	Includes coffee time.
Form 1 (Factors)	1116	1230	Including exercise.
Lunch	1230	1356	
Form 2 (Hazards)	1356	1523	People were late returning from lunch.
Coffee	1523	1552	
Form 3 - (Unmet needs)	1553	1602	

Topic	Start	Finish	Comments
Introduction			
Exercise	1602	1635	
Discussion	1635	1704	Need to consider whether Sphere indicators are more of a bother than an advantage.
Participant Presentations	1705	1759	By participants, covering Nicaragua and Honduras.
Day Three			
Opening	0941	0944	
Participant Presentations	0845	0913	
Form 4 (Possible Environmental Impacts of Assistance)	0914	1004	By Myton
Coffee	1004	1023	
Community Assessment	1023	1118	Exercise not used.
Consolidation and Analysis - Introduction	1119	1140	
Exercise	1140	1317	Exercise improvised.
Lunch	1317	1446	
Discussion	1446	1523	
Green Procurement	1524	1547	No exercise. By Myton.
Break	1547	1558	Also handout of evaluation form.
Implementation Issues	1558	1630	New section to training materials. Needs to be added to Participant=s workbook and Trainer=s Manual.
Comment from participants.	1630	1657	New session to training plan.
Closing	1657	1720	Included diploma distribution.

Annex 2 Consolidation and Analysis Exercise

Step 1

- Form two teams:
 - Team 1: Hurricane Inez/Surima,
 - Team 2: San Marcos, Guatemala, Landslide
- Imagine that you have just returned from the field and have conducted the REA evaluations Module 1 and 2. Now your director has asked that you present a draft of your results based on Annex G of the Guidelines and your plan of action based on Annex H.
- Team 1a y 2a = Organizational REA
- Team 1b y 2b = Community REA
- 45 minutes to identify the 3 most critical themes or issues for each section/category on Form Annex G, Consolidation and Analysis.
- 30 minutes to consolidate the results of each group's team 1 and 2 and prepare Annex H, Action Plan Matrix.

Step 2

- Select a group facilitator and a facilitator for each team within the group. Also select a time-keeper.
- Within your teams, you may want to subdivide responsibilities again. Two or three people on each team could review the critical issues for each category on form Annex G.
- If your team does not have enough information gathered for each form, imagine the situation and make assumptions about what the priorities would be for each category.
- If there is a significant difference of opinion within your group, submit it to a vote or some other fast way of prioritizing themes.

Step 3

- After 45 minutes, both teams within the disaster group should get together, and place their flip-charts next to each other, in order to compare results for the organizational and the community assessments.
- Highlight and consolidate those priorities which both assessment teams have in common. This consolidation can be done horizontally and vertically.
- Again, when you are transferring your results to Annex H, Action Planning Matrix, if there is significant differences of opinion, take a vote on the most critical issues.

Annex 3 Evaluation

Part I

5= Very much in agreement 1=Very much in disagreement

1. REA methodology was well explained	4.25
2. Documents were relevant	4.10
3. Good participation	4.8
4. My expectations were reached	4.4
5. REA is relevant to my work	4.5
6. I would recommend this to my colleagues	4.6
7. Logistics and organization were adequate	4.0

Part 2

What did you most appreciate about this course?

- Enjoyed the group dynamics and green procurement
- Being able to annex this REA to the Disaster Evaluation and Needs Assessment Methodology
- Raising awareness of environmental impacts of disasters; including community perceptions and perspectives in the assessment
- REA focus on taking care of organizational and community perspectives
- Applying the tools, good presentation skills of trainers, their knowledge and enthusiasm
- Very innovative, the methodology, its practicality
- Methodology REA, and those factors that affect the environment
- Process of consolidation and analysis.
- Order of the concepts and their examples
- Innovation, methodology
- Very practical exercises, and the group work
- Quality of the presenters, Additional information by the presenters
- Organizational evaluation
- Having done the workshop in Spanish, and the rapid work and professionalism in disasters
- The tools developed and the practical exercises.
- The professionalism of the instructors and the participatory nature of the course. Compatibility with disaster evaluation and needs Assessment methodology.

What suggestions for improvement?

- More examples needed
- Confirm the translations
- More applications
- I understand a great effort was made to do this workshop in Spanish – we need to recognize this effort and thank them. However, the materials need to be completed and better terminology used.
- Need some kind of field test to apply the REA, perhaps in a nearby marginal community

- Better time management
- More variety in the training team and participants, need people who work directly with communities
- Finish the Spanish translations. Simplify the concepts, without losing content.
- Better logistics.
- Improve the language translations.
- Need more time, another half day to complete the Consolidation and Analysis section.

Part 3 Session Evaluation. 5=Excellent 1=Unacceptable

	Quality	Relevance
1.1 Bienvenido, introducciones y objetivos	4.20	4.25
1.2 El Nexa Medio Ambiente – Desastres	4.30	4.5
1.3 Marco conceptual y el proceso de la ERA	4.30	4.4
1.4 El Manejo de desastre y sus fases	4.15	4.35
1.5 Introducción a la evaluación en desastres	4.30	4.55
2.2 Modulo 1: Declaración de Contexto	4.33	4.6
2.3. Factores que afectan el posible impacto medio ambiental	4.33	4.5
2.4 Posibles impactos medio ambientales inmediatos del desastre	4.44	4.55
2.5 Necesidades Insatisfechas/ Proyecto Esfera	4.37	4.6
2.6 Posible impacto de la ayuda humanitaria	4.37	4.55
2.7 Experiencia/Presentaciones por parte de los participantes	4.15	4.0
3.2 Modulo 2: Evaluación a nivel de la comunidad	4.0	4.5
3.3 Modulo 3: Consolidación y Analisis	4.12	4.5
3.4 Modulo 4: Revisión verde / Procuración Verde	4.1	4.45
3.5 Ejecutando la ERA	4.4	4.35

Part 4 How prepared are you now to conduct the REA? 5=Very prepared. 1=Not prepared.

Average score was 4.15.

Annex 4 Participant List

LISTADO DE PARTICIPANTES		Evaluacion Medio Ambiental Rapida en Desastres			
23-25 2003, CASA SANTO DOMINGO, ANTIGUA GUATEMALA, GUATEMALA					
No.	Nombre	Organización	Dirección y País	E-Mail	Telefono/Fax
1	Juan Manuel Giron	Care Guatemala	4ta calle 7-38 zona 3, Coban, Alta Verapaz, Guatemala	jgiron@care.org.gt	9521194 Coban 3391139 Guatemala
2	Mario E. Flores	Care El Salvador	Colonia Lomas de San Francisco, Calle 3, Casa # 20, San Salvador	marioflores@care.org.sv	2734100 Ext. 272
3	Rene Molina	Care El Salvador	Colonia Lomas de San Francisco, Calle 3, Casa # 20, San Salvador	renemolina@care.org.sv	8853757
4	Mario Pareja-trainer	Consultor	1764 vie de 'Etraz 01220 Divonne-les-Bains	parejamr@hotmail.com	33450203812
5	Maria Edna Vidaurre	Care Guatemala	1ra. Avenida 4-36 zona 2, Coban, Alta Verapaz, Guatemala	mariaevid@yahoo.com	9521045 6913085
6	Luis Gonzalez	Trocaire	Avenida Bernal y Pasaje Quintanilla 210 Edificio QH local 3, San Salvador, El Salvador	trocaire1@123.com.sv	(503) 2610781 (503) 2600166
7	Magdalena Cortez	REDES	Colonia Miramonte Calle Cerro Verde 3028	cgr2@redes.org	(503) 2601474
8	Geovani Marroquin	REDES	Colonia Miramonte Calle Cerro Verde 3028	cgr2@redes.org	(503) 2601474
9	Elena Duran	REDES	Colonia Miramonte Calle Cerro Verde 3028	cgr2@redes.org	(503) 2601474
10	Henry Leonel Aldana	INSIVUMEH	7av. 14-57 zona 13, Guatemala	aldanaz@hotmail.com	3314967 Ext. 207
11	Juan Jose Sinay Garcia	INSIVUMEH	7av. 14-57 zona 13, Guatemala	meteorologo67@hotmail.com	3314897 3394849
12	Rigoberto Giron	Care Internacional	Avenida Costa Rica, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	giron@hon.care.org	(504) 2355055
13	Denis Peña Solano	OPS/OMS	Managua-Nicaragua	penad@nic.ops-oms.org	(505) 2894200/2894999
14	Miguel Omar Montoya	OPS/OMS	Tegucigalpa, Honduras	fcoymae@hotmail.com	2339765
15	Francisca Orellana	Care El Salvador	San Salvador, El Salvador	forellana@care.org.sv	2734100
16	Paul Ugarte	CONRED	Avenida Hincapie 21-72 Zona 13, Guatemala	p_ugarte@hotmail.com	3854144 3852509
17	Oscar Juarez	CONRED	Avenida Hincapie 21-72 Zona 13, Guatemala	ojuarez@conred.org.gt	3854144 3852509
18	Roberto Peralta	Care Honduras	Avenida Costa Rica, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	peralta@hon.care.org	(504) 2355055
19	Wilmer Dan Teni Pop	Care Guatemala	2da. Calle 8-40 zona 3, Coban, Alta Verapaz, Guatemala	coban@care.org.gt	8116364
20	Esteban Salvador Casado Sun	Care Guatemala	3ra. Calle 6-32 Zona 1, Coban, Alta Verapaz, Guatemala	salvadorc@itelqua.com	9511008
21	Carlos R. Montes	Care Honduras	Avenida Costa Rica, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	montes@hon.care.org	(504) 2355055
22	Charles Dufresne - trainer	INTERWORKS	116 North Few St. Madison, Wisconsin	dufresne@interworksmadison.com	608-251-9440
23	Charles Kelly – REA Advisor	BIENFIELD HAZARD RESEARCH CENTRE	Ste 211 7758 Wisc. Ave. Bethesda MD 20814 USA	72734.2412@COMPUSERVE.com	
24	Brenda M. Sagastume A.	Care Guatemala	Coban, Alta Verapaz	jgiron@care.org.gt	6102176
25	Becky Myton - TRainer	Care Honduras	Avenida Costa Rica, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	myton@hon.car.org	(504) 2355055



**Taller Evaluación Medio Ambiental Rápida (ERA), Organizado por CARE, InterWorks
y BGHRC/UCL,
Casa de Santo Domingo,
Antigua Guatemala, Guatemala, 23-25 de abril de 2003**

Annex 5 Workshop Agenda

Antigua, Guatemala

23-25 April 2003

Day 1 Background and Overview

8:30	Welcome , (Rigoberto) introductions, and workshop objectives (C. Dufresne).
9:00	The environment – disaster connection (C. Dufresne)
10:30	Break
10:45	REA conceptual framework (M. Pareja)
12:00	Lunch
1:00	Disaster management context (C. Dufresne)
2:30	Break
2:45	Basic assessment reporting (C. Dufresne)
4:15	Participant feedback (C. Dufresne)
4:30	Adjourn

Day 2 Introduction to REA

8:30	Review of Day 1
8:45	Module One: Context statement. (M. Pareja)
9:30	Factors influencing environmental impacts (C. Dufresne)
10:15	Break
10:30	Possible immediate environmental impacts of hazards (M. Pareja)
11:30	Unmet basic needs. (C. Dufresne)
12:15	Lunch
1:15	Unmet basic needs, continued (C. Dufresne)
2:00	Potential negative consequences of possible relief activities (B. Myton-Day 3)
2:45	Break
3:00	Participant experience (C. Dufresne; 4 presentations, Day 2/3)
4:00	Review
4:30	Adjourn

Day 3 – REA Process: pulling it all together

8:30	Review of Day 2
8:45	Module Two: Community Level Assessment (M. Pareja)
10:15	Break
10:30	Module Three: Consolidation and Analysis (C. Dufresne)
12:00	Lunch
1:00	Module Three, continued (C. Dufresne)
1:30	Module Four: Green Review of Relief Procurement (B. Myton)
2:30	Break
2:45	REA implementation issues (M. Pareja)
4:00	Evaluation and closing. (C. Dufresne; Kelly.)
4:30	Adjourn

Annex 6 Pre-workshop planning coordination matrix

Tasks or decisions to be made	Responsibilities or coordination required (For each designate the Lead person or entity responsible (L), and the others who have key or secondary responsibilities (S), or who simply need to be consulted or notified of progress (C))				
	CARE USA	CARE CAMI	InterWorks	Benfield Hazard R. Ctr./REA consultants	Other
Establish workshop objectives	C	C	Paul T. (S)	Kelly (L)	
Plan the workshop programme	C	C	Paul T. (L)	Kelly (S)	
Select, reserving and paying for the venue	L	C			
Invite or select participants	(S)	L	C	C	
Review the resource / training materials and develop new material if necessary					
Confirm training team and responsibilities					
Determine if translations required, and how the translated documents will be verified for accuracy					
Identify characteristics of the audience (language ability, background, gender, level of knowledge or experience with the topic, etc.)					
Discuss equipment needs and arrange to rent or borrow					
If field visits are planned, visit workshop and field visit sites and confirm arrangements. Seek permission if required.					
Prepare workshop budget, programme and logistics (date, venue, time)					
Clarify arrangements for lodging, meals, coffee breaks, cost, etc...					